UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/429,522	10/28/1999	PETER C. BAHRS	AUS990339US3	6039

35525   7590   10/23/2003

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/429,522	BAHRS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	CESAR B PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 August 2003</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>64-75 and 77-82</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>64-75 and 77-82</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/5/2003.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the amendment, claim 76 has been canceled. Claims 64-75, and 77-82 are pending in

the case. Claims 64, 66, 69, 77, 79, and 82 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 64, 66-71, 73-74, 76-77, and 79-82 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Poff et al, hereinafter Poff (Pat. # 6,330,659, 12/11/2001, filed on

11/6/1997) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4.   The rejections of claims 65, 72, 75, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Poff et al, hereinafter Poff (Pat. # 6,330,659, 12/11/2001, filed on 11/6/1997), in view of

"Mastering JavaBeans", Vanhelsuwe, L., Sybex, 1997, chapter 3 have been withdrawn as

necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

5.   The drawings filed on 3/27/2000 have been approved by the draftsperson.

Claim Objections

6.   Claims 66-68 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 66 recites

"the containers", "the events is", lines 6, and 15 respectively. It appears that this should be

instead "the container', and "the events are" respectively, since there is only a single previous

container mentioned in the claim, and so that the article agrees with its noun "events".

7.   Claims 66-68 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 66 recites "an

events" line 6. It appears that this should be instead "an event", so that the article agrees with its

noun.

8.   Claims 79-81 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 79 recites "a

containers", and "an events" line 8, 10 respectively. It appears that this should be instead "a

container", so that the article agrees with its noun.

9.   Claims 79-81 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 79 recites

"the events is", line 18. It appears that this should be instead "the events are", so that the article

agrees with its noun "events".

        Appropriate correction is required, of these informalities, <u>and any other informalities

found in the claims not pointed out by the Examiner.</u>

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11.   Claims 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Claim 79 recites: "the placement object controls the location of the places the

container in the graphical user interface in response to receive an events" lines 9-11. It is unclear

what is taking place in this limitation.

12.   Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 66-68, 74, and 79-81,therefore the

rejections have been withdrawn

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 64, 66-71, 73-74, 76-77, and 79-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Poff et al, hereinafter Poff (Pat. # 6,330,659, 12/11/2001, filed on 11/6/1997),

further in view of Morgan et al, hereinafter Morgan (Pat. # 6,054,985, 4/25/2000, filed on

1/27/1997).

        Regarding independent claim 64, Poff discloses a system for creating, and displaying

containers, such as windows, frames, panels, buttons, menu bars, etc, in computer display using a

windowing system task processor—*first object* (col.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, col.15, lines56-67, fig.7,

11).

Moreover, Poff discloses the sending of user input request, to manage and control

windows in the computer display, from the task processor to the accelerator—*third object.* The

input is then passed to a rendering engine, which renders and display the window in accordance

with the user's input (col. 12, lines 25-31, col. 15, lines 56-67). Poff fails to explicitly disclose:

controlling a location of the component within the display using a second object, wherein the

second object controls the location of the component in response to receiving an event from the

third object. However, Morgan teaches the moving (*controlling*) of a window by dragging and

dropping it to a new location in a computer screen (col.4, lines 3-20, col.7, lines 14-67, fig.2-4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

have combined the teachings of Poff, and Morgan to control the location of the windows taught

by Morgan using the rendering engine of Poff, because Poff teaches the benefit of reducing

performance degradation, and the efficient use of object oriented programming (col.3, lines 47-

51). So that all the window management operations would be efficiently carried out without

affecting the performance of the computer system.

Moreover, Poff discloses the accelerator uses the user's input for the creation, and update

of windows, and passing the input the rendering engine, which renders and display the window

in accordance with the user's input (col. 12, lines 25-31, col. 15, lines 56-col.16, line 18, col. 17,

lines 1- col.19, line 22). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *using by the third object, the user input*

to determine whether a change in location is required. However, Morgan teaches the moving

(*controlling*) of a window by dragging and dropping it to a new location in a computer screen

(col.4, lines 3-20, col.7, lines 14-67, fig.2-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Poff, and Morgan to determine whether the location of the windows taught by Morgan, should be moved using the accelerator of Poff, because Poff teaches the benefit of reducing performance degradation, and the efficient use of object oriented programming (col.3, lines 47-51). So that all the window management operations would be efficiently carried out without affecting the performance of the computer system.

Furthermore, Poff discloses the accelerator uses the user's input event for the creation, and update of windows, generating and passing the input the rendering engine, which renders and display the window in accordance with the user's input (col. 12, lines 25-31, col. 15, lines 56-col.16, line 18, col. 17, lines 1- col.19, line 22). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *responsive to a determination by the third object that the change in the location is required, selectively displaying the component using the third object by generating the event by the third object, the event indicating that the location is to be changed.* However, Morgan teaches the moving *(controlling)* of a window by dragging and dropping it to a new location in a computer screen (col.4, lines 3-20, col.7, lines 14-67, fig.2-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Poff, and Morgan to determine whether the location of the windows taught by Morgan, should be moved using the accelerator of Poff, because Poff teaches the benefit of reducing performance degradation, and the efficient use of object oriented programming (col.3, lines 47-51). So that all the window management operations would be efficiently carried out without affecting the performance of the computer system.

Claim 66 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 64, where the component is the container, the first object is the view controller, the second object is the placement object, and the third object is the application mediator, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 67, which depends on claim 66, Poff discloses a system for creating, and displaying containers, such as windows, frames, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer display using a Java rendering engine (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

Regarding claim 68, which depends on claim 66, Poff discloses a system for creating, and displaying containers, such as windows, frames, buttons, panels, menu bars, etc, in computer display using a Java rendering engine (c.4,L.42-c.5,L.27, c.16,L.6-67, fig.7, 11).

Claims 69-71, 73-74 are directed towards a display mechanism for implementing the steps found in claim 66, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 77, 79-81 are directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claims 64, and 66-68, respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 82 is directed towards a computer program product for storing the steps found in claim 64, and therefore is similarly rejected.

15.   Claims 65, 72, 75, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Poff, in view of Morgan, and further in view of "Mastering JavaBeans", Vanhelsuwe, L., Sybex,

1997, chapter 3.

        Regarding claim 65, which depends on claim 64, Poff discloses the sending of user input

request, to manage and control windows in the computer display, from the task processor—*view

controller,* to the accelerator—*application mediator.* The input is then passed to a rendering

engine, which renders and display the window in accordance with the user's input (col. 12, lines

25-31, col. 15, lines 56-67). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: *a placement listener.* However,

Javabeans teaches the separation between event sources, and entities to act on them—listeners

(p.5, L.1-30). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to have provided such object, because this would improve the software errors,

maintenance hazards, and performance as taught by Javabeans (p.4).

        Regarding claim 72, which depends on claim 70, Poff discloses the sending of user input

request, to manage and control windows in the computer display, from the task processor—*view

controller,* to the accelerator—*application mediator.* The input is then passed to a rendering

engine, which renders and display the window in accordance with the user's input (col. 12, lines

25-31, col. 15, lines 56-67). Poff fails to explicitly disclose: —*positioning object is an instance

of a placement listener.* However, Javabeans teaches the separation between event sources, and

entities to act on them—listeners (p.5, L.1-30). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided such object, because this

would improve the software errors, maintenance hazards, and performance as taught by

Javabeans (p.4).

Claim 75 is directed towards a display mechanism for implementing the steps found in

claim 65, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 78 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 65, and

therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims1-75, and 77-82 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants remark that Poff does not

teach a third object, which receives a user input from the window panel, and the amended

limitations of the claims (page 7, lines 10). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of

these newly introduced limitations as outlined above.

Furthermore, the Applicants remark that Vanhelsuwe fails to teach the combination of the

amended limitations of the claims (page 7, lines 16-23). The Applicants are directed towards the

rejection of these newly introduced limitations as outlined above.

Conclusion

17.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Diedrich et al. (Pat. # 6,064,382), and Mclean et al. (Pat. # 5,819,055).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at

least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

>   Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

>   Washington, D.C. 20231   .

>   Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306,** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

10/17/03

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER